

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**  
 Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Discussion Issues

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
A. Transition Strategy		
<p>A1. Does the Transition Strategy protect existing businesses? Does it go beyond the goal of protecting existing businesses? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>                      Commissioner Miller reflected on the Commission’s August 6, 2014 recommendation for the Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan and the subsequent work involving the design of a transition strategy in the South Marymoor Subarea for protecting existing businesses and posed the question of whether the recommended policies and codes strike the right balance in providing protection for business and supporting the vision.</p> <p>Commissioner Miller noted that his interest was in understanding how the transition strategy affects the entire Subarea. He was satisfied with staff’s description of the South Marymoor Subarea Committee’s interest in this regard and closed this item.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u>                      Resolution 1415, adopted by the City Council in 2014 provides intent for the transition strategy including continued economic vitality of existing and future manufacturing uses. This intent statement translated into some of the factors the South Marymoor Subarea Committee considered in recommending the transition strategy. Of the Committee’s three primary factors, Allowed Uses and Timing relate closely to the intent in Resolution 1415.</p> <p>Staff agreed with the Committee’s recommendation that is described in the Technical Committee Report, pages 8-9 and in the South Marymoor Subarea Committee Report. The recommendation, Report Exhibit C1 pages 3-12, supports existing businesses remaining and expanding as well as additional manufacturing and a variety of other uses becoming established in the subarea. Proposed RZC 21.13.210.B.3, MDD Transition Strategy, Page 41 of Report Exhibit C1 also recommends notice to new businesses and residents of ongoing support for business and Marymoor Park operations. Staff believes these recommendations in conjunction with the absence of transitional timing requirements provide strong protections for economic vitality of existing businesses and establishment of new businesses including for new manufacturing and variety of other uses. Staff also believes the recommendation for adding multifamily housing as an allowed use and the infrastructure plan in providing for development of the area are consistent with the subarea vision for a</p>	<p>Opened 1/11</p> <p>Closed 1/18</p>

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>walkable, denser subarea featuring opportunities for living, employment, and other activities.</p> <p>1/18: The South Marymoor Subarea Committee in its consideration of a recommended strategy for land use transition in the area south of NE 65<sup>th</sup> Street also requested applying the recommended expanded use zone as a transition strategy across the Marymoor subarea.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
<p>A2. How does the proposed plan meet both goals of policy N-SE-39 and N-SE-40 concurrently? (Miller, Jan. 13, 2017 item #3)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>Commissioner Miller requested information on how the proposed plan meets both of the goals concurrently stated in policy N-SE-39 and N-SE-40.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N-SE-39 Focus employment growth nearest the light rail station. Focus residential growth near Marymoor Park. Accommodate at least 700 new homes in the subarea or other parts of Redmond to offset reductions in residential capacity in the Northeast Subarea.</li> <li>• N-SE-40 Incorporate housing into the Marymoor Subarea that is walkable to the station. Maintain opportunities for transit-oriented development that includes housing capacity in close proximity to the light rail station and for housing capacity in the areas closest to Marymoor Park.</li> </ul> <p>He also asked staff to provide the projected employment and residential densities for the Subarea at buildout and the potential employment and residential population and light rail trip generation within ¼ and ½ mile of the station.</p> <p>1/25: Commissioner Miller clarified that his question was in reference to portions of the recommended amendments that describe employment nearest the light rail station though not as context across the entire Marymoor Subarea in mixed-use development zones. He requested that staff update the policies cited above and closed this item.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p>2/8: Staff recommends amending N-SE-39 for clarification as follows: “Focus employment growth in a mixed-use context nearest the light rail station...[remainder unchanged]”</p>	<p>Opened 1/18</p> <p>Closed 1/25</p>

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status												
	<p>The proposed land use and zoning designations for the four new design districts (MDD1-2, MDD4-5) of the Marymoor Subarea would expand the allowed uses to include multifamily housing and other uses while continuing to allow employment uses. This is summarized in proposed policies N-SE-35.5 and N-SE-35.7 on pages 2-3 of Exhibit A to the Technical Committee report. MDD1 is the zone closest to the light rail station. It allows the highest overall FAR and the highest non-residential FAR, while still requiring a minimum 25% residential component (by floor area) for each new development. The MDD2 and MDD5 zones would require a minimum 50% residential component (by floor area) and are walkable to the light rail station. In this way, both housing and employment are accommodated within walking distance of the station, with employment being emphasized immediately adjacent to the station.</p> <p>The Marymoor Subarea measures approximately 0.5 miles in both width and length. To its farthest point from the future light rail station area is approximately 0.7 miles and by way of the East Lake Sammamish Trail, approximately 0.8 miles. Implementation of the planned network of sidewalks and trail connections over time will help ensure access to a variety of non-motorized routes for people living, working in, and visiting the Subarea as well as Marymoor Park to take advantage of light rail service.</p> <p>Staff anticipates the following density and populations at build out for the Subarea based on the proposed zoning standards:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="682 1047 1795 1408"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="682 1047 913 1156">Measurement</th> <th data-bbox="913 1047 1354 1156">Employment (Non-Residential) Floor Area / Job Capacity Estimate</th> <th data-bbox="1354 1047 1795 1156">Units / Population Estimate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="682 1156 913 1230">¼ mile of light rail station</td> <td data-bbox="913 1156 1354 1230">1.65 million sq. ft. / 3,300 to 6,600 jobs</td> <td data-bbox="1354 1156 1795 1230">1,070 / 2,097</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="682 1230 913 1305">½ mile of light rail station</td> <td data-bbox="913 1230 1354 1305">3.5msf / 7,000 to 14,000 jobs</td> <td data-bbox="1354 1230 1795 1305">2,066 / 4,767</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="682 1305 913 1408">Marymoor Subarea</td> <td data-bbox="913 1305 1354 1408">4.1msf of non-residential uses including office, industrial, and retail – the employment capacity</td> <td data-bbox="1354 1305 1795 1408">2,431 multi-family homes - the populations listed above are</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Measurement	Employment (Non-Residential) Floor Area / Job Capacity Estimate	Units / Population Estimate	¼ mile of light rail station	1.65 million sq. ft. / 3,300 to 6,600 jobs	1,070 / 2,097	½ mile of light rail station	3.5msf / 7,000 to 14,000 jobs	2,066 / 4,767	Marymoor Subarea	4.1msf of non-residential uses including office, industrial, and retail – the employment capacity	2,431 multi-family homes - the populations listed above are	
Measurement	Employment (Non-Residential) Floor Area / Job Capacity Estimate	Units / Population Estimate												
¼ mile of light rail station	1.65 million sq. ft. / 3,300 to 6,600 jobs	1,070 / 2,097												
½ mile of light rail station	3.5msf / 7,000 to 14,000 jobs	2,066 / 4,767												
Marymoor Subarea	4.1msf of non-residential uses including office, industrial, and retail – the employment capacity	2,431 multi-family homes - the populations listed above are												

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes		Status
		listed above is based on 2-4 jobs/1,000 sq ft gfa	based on 1.96 average number of persons per multifamily home
	<u>Public Comment</u>		
<b>B. Local Center Designation</b>			
<p>B1. What are the benefits of designating the Marymoor area as a Local Center? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>                      Commissioner Miller asked staff to describe benefits that could be derived by designating Marymoor as a local center.</p> <p>1/18: Commissioner Miller also asked whether the designation is a self-certification, based on staff direction. He asked whether it is a pre-requisite for funding and if other funding options are available or possible. Commissioner Miller was satisfied with staff’s response and closed this item.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A Marymoor Local Center designation complements and supports the long-term vision, policies and proposed zoning for the Marymoor subarea.</li> <li>○ A local center designation may better position the city to compete for federal and countywide grant funds to implement Marymoor subarea infrastructure and transportation planning concepts. In recent years designated local centers in Puget Sound have successfully competed for funding from the Surface Transportation Program (STP), as well as from the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program, two sources of federal funds allocated by PSRC. (PSRC, Regional TOD Advisory Committee, Regional Centers Framework Update Project Presentation, May 8, 2015). Also, King County Metro’s financial resources for bus transit target designated growth areas.</li> <li>○ Although City infrastructure investments in the Marymoor area will likely be limited in the near-term in order to support completion of needed infrastructure in Redmond’s two urban centers, Marymoor is poised to become the City’s next area for focused investment after Downtown and Overlake. Hence, a local center designation would affirm the City’s intent that Marymoor likely would be the next planned growth area and a focus area for future City infrastructure investments.</li> </ul>		<p>Opened 1/11</p> <p>Closed 1/18</p>

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
<p>B2. What is the purpose and timing for the 2017 docketed item that will address the area near the Southeast Redmond light rail station including the Redmond Way portion of the proposed Local Center designation? (Nichols, Miller)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>                      Commissioners Nichols and Miller, reflecting on testimony from Mark Zenger, requested additional information regarding the purpose and anticipated timing for addressing the portion of the proposed Local Center designation that involves the Redmond Way (SR-202) corridor beyond the Marymoor Subarea? They asked how the future work and the analysis of the area will relate to the current plan amendments for the Marymoor Subarea and to the Southeast Redmond neighborhood.</p> <p>1/25: Commissioners Nichols and Miller were satisfied with staff’s response for ensuring continued tracking of this item and ensuring coordination with the Marymoor Subarea planning work. They agreed to close this item.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u>                      1/20: During the process to develop the recommended land use transition strategy and infrastructure plan for the Marymoor subarea, the question of whether the land use designation and zoning for the area along Redmond Way to the north of the planned light rail station should be re-evaluated was first identified by staff. At that time, the Marymoor subarea process was significantly underway and to have expanded it for this area would have been very difficult. Instead, staff recommended and Planning Commission and City Council agreed that this topic should be on the docket for 2016-17 which Council adopted in October 2016. The purpose of this proposal is to evaluate whether the other parts of the Southeast Redmond neighborhood that are also within walking distance of the station and may be appropriate for different land uses and land use intensities than are allowed by current zoning. The soonest that staff would initiate work on this topic is during the 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of 2017 due to being fully committed on other projects. However, it is a topic on the work plan and that Planning staff are committed to undertake.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u>                      Mark Zenger testified on 1/18 regarding his concerns for the proposed transportation improvements and impacts to his properties and businesses including the Redmond Pancake</p>	<p>Opened 1/11</p> <p>Closed 1/25</p>

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status																																										
	House, Redmond Inn, and Redmond Tire Pros. He described his confusion for his property being outside of the Marymoor Subarea in relationship to the proposed Subarea policies and zoning though being within the Local Center designation.																																											
<b>C. Marymoor Subarea Zoning</b>																																												
C1. Zoning designation for the property owned by Lake Washington Institute of Technology – requested change from MDD4 to MDD2. (Nichols)	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>                  2/8: In receipt of a 2/8 letter from Lake Washington Institute of Technology further describing its interest in seeking the proposed zoning change, the Commission agreed that the change from MDD4 to MDD2 would afford better utilization of the site in the future. The Commission then closed the issue.</p> <p>1/25: Commissioner Nichols requested additional information from staff describing the intent of this request.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u>                  The differences between MDD4 and MDD2 are largely in allowed uses and maximum floor area. The differences are summarized in tables below.</p> <p><i>Allowed Uses that are Different in MDD4 and MDD2</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="684 906 1520 1424"> <thead> <tr> <th>Use / Use category</th> <th>MDD4</th> <th>MDD2</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Multifamily residential uses</td><td></td><td>P</td></tr> <tr><td>Auto sales, rental, or service</td><td></td><td>P</td></tr> <tr><td>Grocery, food, beverage, or dairy sales</td><td></td><td>P</td></tr> <tr><td>Health and personal care</td><td></td><td>P</td></tr> <tr><td>Convenience store</td><td></td><td>P</td></tr> <tr><td>Finance and insurance</td><td></td><td>P</td></tr> <tr><td>Real estate services</td><td></td><td>P</td></tr> <tr><td>Travel arrangement or reservation services</td><td></td><td>P</td></tr> <tr><td>Investigation and security services</td><td></td><td>P</td></tr> <tr><td>Hotel or motel</td><td></td><td>P</td></tr> <tr><td>Bed and breakfast inn</td><td></td><td>P</td></tr> <tr><td>Rail transportation</td><td>P</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Truck and freight transportation</td><td>P</td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Use / Use category	MDD4	MDD2	Multifamily residential uses		P	Auto sales, rental, or service		P	Grocery, food, beverage, or dairy sales		P	Health and personal care		P	Convenience store		P	Finance and insurance		P	Real estate services		P	Travel arrangement or reservation services		P	Investigation and security services		P	Hotel or motel		P	Bed and breakfast inn		P	Rail transportation	P		Truck and freight transportation	P		<p>Opened 1/11</p> <p>Closed 2/8</p>
Use / Use category	MDD4	MDD2																																										
Multifamily residential uses		P																																										
Auto sales, rental, or service		P																																										
Grocery, food, beverage, or dairy sales		P																																										
Health and personal care		P																																										
Convenience store		P																																										
Finance and insurance		P																																										
Real estate services		P																																										
Travel arrangement or reservation services		P																																										
Investigation and security services		P																																										
Hotel or motel		P																																										
Bed and breakfast inn		P																																										
Rail transportation	P																																											
Truck and freight transportation	P																																											

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes					Status																									
	Postal services	P																													
	Heliport	C																													
	Arts, entertainment, and recreation uses ( <i>except parks, which are allowed in MDD4 and MDD2</i> )		P																												
	Cremation services and cemeteries	P																													
	Automobile parking facilities		P																												
	<i>P = permitted use; C = conditional use</i>																														
	<i>Floor Area</i>																														
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="678 550 951 584"></th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="961 550 1255 584">MDD4</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1266 550 1560 584">MDD2</th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="678 584 951 618"></td> <td data-bbox="961 584 1045 618">Base</td> <td data-bbox="1056 584 1255 618">With Incentives</td> <td data-bbox="1266 584 1350 618">Base</td> <td data-bbox="1360 584 1560 618">With Incentives</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="678 618 951 652">Residential FAR</td> <td data-bbox="961 618 1045 652">0.0</td> <td data-bbox="1056 618 1255 652">0.0</td> <td data-bbox="1266 618 1350 652">0.76</td> <td data-bbox="1360 618 1560 652">1.91</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="678 652 951 686">Non-residential FAR</td> <td data-bbox="961 652 1045 686">0.5</td> <td data-bbox="1056 652 1255 686">1.4</td> <td data-bbox="1266 652 1350 686">0.38</td> <td data-bbox="1360 652 1560 686">1.53</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="678 686 951 721">Total FAR</td> <td data-bbox="961 686 1045 721">0.5</td> <td data-bbox="1056 686 1255 721">1.4</td> <td data-bbox="1266 686 1350 721">1.5</td> <td data-bbox="1360 686 1560 721">2.54</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						MDD4		MDD2			Base	With Incentives	Base	With Incentives	Residential FAR	0.0	0.0	0.76	1.91	Non-residential FAR	0.5	1.4	0.38	1.53	Total FAR	0.5	1.4	1.5	2.54	
		MDD4		MDD2																											
		Base	With Incentives	Base		With Incentives																									
	Residential FAR	0.0	0.0	0.76		1.91																									
	Non-residential FAR	0.5	1.4	0.38		1.53																									
	Total FAR	0.5	1.4	1.5		2.54																									
	<p>Changing the zone for LWTech and the parcel immediately north (to create logical boundaries) from MDD4 to MDD2 would result in a potential increase of about 268,000 sq ft of floor area on a gross land area of 5.4 acres, assuming all incentives are used. Assuming 50% is residential, that would equate to roughly 134 additional homes and 134,000 sq ft of non-residential space.</p>																														
	<p>The benefit of LWTech’s request is that it could result in additional design flexibility for the site as it evolves. The drawback is that it reduces the effectiveness of the graduated density approach that generally moves from the park boundary toward the interior of the subarea.</p>																														
<p>The proposal would maintain the recommended Height Overlay Area as shown on Map 13.1, Technical Report exhibit C3, page 37 and beyond the Height Overlay Area, would result in an allowed maximum height of 5 stories, compared to 4 stories in the MDD4 zone.</p>																															
<p><u>Public Comment</u></p>																															
<p>The Lake Washington Institute of Technology requested changing the zoning designation for the property owned by LWTech from MDD4 to MDD2.</p>																															

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>C2. How does the MDD4 special regulation portion for road, ground passenger, and transit transportation relate to operations by Sound Transit? (Miller, Jan. 13 and Feb. 3, 2017 item #27)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>                      2/8: Commissioner Miller clarified his concern being in relationship to Sound Transit’s normal light rail operations and was satisfied that the regulation would not impact Sound Transit light rail operations. The Commission then closed the issue.</p> <p>2/3: Commissioner Miller requested additional information describing how this special regulation would be applied to transportation operations such as those provided by Sound Transit.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u>                      MDD4, the proposed zone located between NE 65<sup>th</sup> and NE 68<sup>th</sup> Streets and east of 174<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, includes the following special regulation in the use table, Technical Report, Exhibit C3, page 16 of 43:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Uses in new structures permitted after [eff. date of adopting ord.] shall not be materially detrimental in terms of noise, truck traffic and other potential operational impacts with nearby multistory mixed-use/residential developments.</p> <p>The purpose of this special regulation is to reduce potential negative impacts from uses in new structures as one technique for achieving compatibility between nearby uses. This would not apply to businesses in existing structures. Staff does not anticipate that Sound Transit would have operations in this zone</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	<p>Opened 2/8</p> <p>Closed 2/8</p>
<p>D. Infrastructure Prioritization and Delivery</p>		
<p>D1. Is this the first plan in the City to use this method to identify, prioritize, and phase development of public infrastructure? What is the prioritization schedule for</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>                      3/8: After discussion the Commission recommended designating two additional block faces as “pedestrian-oriented uses encouraged (residential allowed)” on the south side of the future NE 67<sup>th</sup> St and clarifying encouragement for pedestrian-oriented uses at the light station area. The Commission desired to increase street activation in the subarea. The</p>	<p>Opened 1/18</p>

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>infrastructure improvement? Does the Marymoor Subarea plan in general adequately leverage the investment in light rail? (Miller, Jan. 13, 2017 items #2, 5, 12, 20, 21, 39, Nichols, Biethan, MacNichols, Captain, and Baker)</p>	<p>Commission decided to retain the recommendation for the height overlay for the MDD1 zone in order to maintain a height transition from Marymoor Park to the Marymoor Subarea. Similarly, the Commission decided to retain the recommendation for upper-story stepbacks for the MDD2 and MDD5 properties adjoining Marymoor Park.</p> <p>2/15: Commissioners requested additional analysis regarding the height, floor area ratio, infrastructure development, requirements for trails and setbacks, flexibility in uses and design compared with Downtown and Overlake, and other incentives that could further encourage and speed the transition process within the Marymoor subarea. Several Commissioners believed that the accelerated timeline for completing the light rail station creates an opportunity for advancing the transition and capitalizing on light rail access. They requested a comparison of the Marymoor subarea to the other light rail station areas in Redmond to consider development intensity on par with the other three locations.</p> <p>2/8: Commissioners discussed whether the zoning amendments would provide sufficient incentive for property owners to spur redevelopment. Commissioners requested a list of additional or innovative techniques that could be used to further incentivize redevelopment that had not already been considered. Commissioners also expressed a desire to obtain a more systematic approach to infrastructure development as a public benefit from the rezone to reduce the amount of infrastructure that is developed incrementally and conditioned for private development.</p> <p>2/3: Commissioner Miller requested information regarding infrastructure timing and prioritization in relationship to the plan’s references to market forces. He asked whether the plan was the first of its type to recommend identifying, prioritizing, and phasing development of public infrastructure. He also asked for additional information describing the specific market forces, how and when the determination of the forces is made, how deficiencies would be addressed, and how the market forces affect the pace of infrastructure improvements including the opening of the Marymoor light rail station in 2024.</p> <p>Reflecting on the Committee’s report, Commissioner Miller also asked whether incentives would be the sole tool for achieving performance levels of public infrastructure.</p>	

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>1/25: Commissioner Miller further described his question for achieving the Subarea plan’s vision in the context of the accelerated timeline within which light rail is anticipated. He requested that staff provide an enhanced project list that provides more strategic recommendations for specific infrastructure improvements and timing.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p>3/8: The cover memo for the March 8 study session summarizes a presentation that staff will share at the March 8 study session.</p> <p>2/15: A variety of factors can enter into a property owner’s decision to redevelop property. Overall, redevelopment is more likely to occur when a property owner believes that there is more economic value in redevelopment than in a property’s existing use, and then decides to act. The total economic value can be affected either by increasing income to or reducing cost to the property owner and developer. There are some ways the City can influence income and cost for the property owner and/or developer, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allowed floor area: more floor area → more potential income</li> <li>• Allowed height: more height → more floor area → more potential income</li> <li>• Allowed range of uses: more uses → more potential tenants → more potential income</li> <li>• Sharing infrastructure cost: more City investment → reduced private investment → reduced private costs</li> </ul> <p>All of these “dials” that the City can turn operate in the context of the broader economy, and broader economic trends can overwhelm City actions. For example, there is a limit to how much floor area and building height the market supports at a given time. Beyond that limit, no increase the City allows will result in increased economic value of redevelopment.</p> <p>As staff described at the 2/8 meeting, the proposed Zoning Code amendments are designed based on several considerations. With regard to timing, the proposed code is designed to spur short-term redevelopment on properties where there is relatively low value in existing use, and to set the stage for longer-term redevelopment of properties where there is higher value in existing use. Based on Heartland’s work and testimony from property owners, staff believes that the code amendments will achieve that.</p>	

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>Staff is also aiming to implement policy direction for the Marymoor Subarea that it is consistent with the Subarea’s vision, consistent with the City’s commitment to allow for the continuation of existing manufacturing park uses and a graceful transition to a greater variety of uses, and recognizes that this is not an urban center. Development would occur at a lower intensity than Downtown and Overlake. Overlake in particular is an urban center with significant remaining redevelopment capacity and significant infrastructure needs. Now that investments in the Downtown over the past several years are more complete, the City is committed to making increased needed investments in Overlake infrastructure, e.g. the Overlake Village pedestrian-bicycle bridge, the Overlake Village station stormwater vault, and reconstructing portions of 152<sup>nd</sup> Ave NE, to advance the vision for the Overlake urban center. Investments in Marymoor Subarea infrastructure need to be prioritized in that context given that funding for capital infrastructure improvements is finite. As noted below, the priority projects for the Marymoor Subarea would make significant improvements to non-motorized travel in the subarea.</p> <p>Heartland’s work indicates that the proposed zoning regulations would spur some near-term redevelopment. The arrival of light rail and other economic events may spur more. If, after a period of time, the City concludes that the pace of redevelopment is not sufficient, then the City can take another look and evaluate whether amendments to the Zoning Code or other actions would likely make an impact. On the other hand, returning at a later date to reduce development potential that a property owner is already expecting is very unlikely.</p> <p>2/8: The “Implementation Strategy” section of the draft Marymoor Subarea Infrastructure Planning Report begins on page 61. Page 63 identifies the most significant project in terms of scope, impact, and cost: the Station Area and Access Project. This project would provide non-motorized access to the station from Marymoor Park and East Lake Sammamish Trail, and would improve NE 70<sup>th</sup> St west of Redmond Way and construct 173<sup>rd</sup> Ave NE between NE 67<sup>th</sup> St (now Ct) and NE 70<sup>th</sup> St. Because this project is tied directly to light rail, it would open at the time light rail service commences in 2024. These improvements would provide new frontage to every block in MDD1 and some of MDD2, potentially catalyzing redevelopment of those blocks.</p>	

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>The second priority project is the extension of NE 70<sup>th</sup> St from Redmond Way to 180<sup>th</sup> Ave NE. This project is expected to be constructed as redevelopment occurs on the two adjacent parcels. One, a Woodspring Hotel, is under construction. This project is important for vehicle circulation near the Marymoor Subarea, as it provides a more direct route to access the subarea from the north, without passing through the 180<sup>th</sup> Ave NE/Redmond Way intersection.</p> <p>The first two projects include related utility improvements.</p> <p>The third priority project is the Type 1 Street Enhancements project. These are re-channelization projects to provide separated bicycle facilities on 65<sup>th</sup>, 67<sup>th</sup>, and 176<sup>th</sup>. This project is included because it makes important bicycle system connections. It is not expected to accelerate redevelopment. There is not yet a specific timeline associated with this project. It does not depend on the completion of other projects.</p> <p>Combined, the three projects would accelerate redevelopment of the subarea closest to the light rail station, economic conditions permitting, improve access to the station and subarea for vehicles, and improve the non-motorized along key subarea corridors. The three projects would also complete the Type 1 street grid, providing for primary vehicle and bicycle circulation.</p> <p>As in Overlake, the draft plan proposes that improvements with primarily local benefit would be constructed by developers as redevelopment occurs. The benefit of this approach is that it commits public resources to projects that will have the greatest public benefit. One drawback of this approach is that it may leave gaps in the finer-grained grid for unknown periods of time.</p> <p>1/25: The City undertook infrastructure planning in the Marymoor Subarea in order to develop conceptual plans for how infrastructure will be laid-out as growth occurs. Absent a plan the City would adopt zoning regulations and evaluate infrastructure needs on a project-by-project basis without the ability to coordinate infrastructure across the subarea.</p>	

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>The City undertook a similar effort in Overlake for the area north of NE 24<sup>th</sup> St that was completed in 2011, and is finishing a similar effort for the area south of NE 24<sup>th</sup> St this year. (Those documents are available at <a href="http://redmond.gov/cms/One.aspx?portalId=169&amp;pageId=130630">http://redmond.gov/cms/One.aspx?portalId=169&amp;pageId=130630</a>.)</p> <p>The draft infrastructure plan identifies three sets of priority projects. In general priority projects are those that support redevelopment. Priority projects may be publicly or privately funded, or funded in partnerships.</p> <p>Three priority projects are identified in the draft plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Light rail station area access improvements</li> <li>2. NE 70<sup>th</sup> St extension</li> <li>3. Type 1 street enhancements</li> </ol> <p>As newly-identified projects, the City is proposing to add them to the Unfunded Buildout Plan in the Transportation Master Plan. All other new street connections are also recommended to be added to the Unfunded Buildout Plan. From there these projects compete with other projects across Redmond to be added to the financially-constrained Transportation Facilities Plan, and then into future capital improvement programs. Projects on the Unfunded Buildout Plan have no timeline because no funding has been identified.</p> <p>The station area access improvements are an unusual case because Sound Transit has a defined timeline for opening light rail in the subarea and has already identified a set of transportation improvements that are documented in the 2011 East Link Record of Decision (ROD). The 2011 ROD predates this planning effort and so Sound Transit’s 2011 plans do not neatly align with the proposed transportation network. Part of Sound Transit’s preliminary engineering phase will be working with the City to identify required access improvements that are consistent with City plans and the East Link ROD.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u>                  2/15: Pete Stone and Allison Keeler submitted an email requesting the Marymoor subarea plan:                  - Increase the floor area ratio and maximum site coverage to allow for greater density;</p>	

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Remove the requirement for property owners to develop on their parcels trails to Marymoor Park; and</li> <li>- Remove the requirement for stepping and setting back development from the park edge.</li> </ul>	
<p>D2. How was policy N-SE-46 developed and how did the subarea planning process propose deleting this policy? (Miller, Jan. 13, 2017 item #22, Captain, Baker)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>2/15: Commissioner Miller requested additional specificity for the policy language “safe” and “convenient” and suggested incorporating performance standards in order to better define safety and convenience in this context. He agreed to close this item and to communicate with staff on language that addresses this item. Commissioner Baker agreed with the need for opportunities for pedestrians to cross SR-202 in the neighborhood and in vicinity of the Marymoor subarea.</p> <p>2/8: Commissioners agreed that the need for a safe crossing of Redmond Way exists, and agreed that generalizing the policy rather than deleting the policy would be the preferred approach.</p> <p>2/3: In reference to the Committee’s report exhibit E, Commission Miller requested information on how policy N-SE-46 was originally developed and the process through which it is proposed for deletion. He asked whether the topic was initiated and addressed in PARCC and TMP planning efforts, how the Subarea plan addressed the design of the regionally significant facilities, and whether outreach regarding this topic should involve the SE Redmond neighborhood as a whole.</p> <p>1/25: Commissioner Miller and Captain requested additional information including alternatives considered and estimated pedestrian counts to describe the basis for removal of this policy.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p>3/8: In order to better define “safe” and “convenient” and to document this project is a functional plan, staff proposes to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Keep the policy language as proposed on 2/15 (see below), and</li> <li>2. Add the project to the Unfunded Buildout Plan in the Transportation Master Plan, and to use the project description to better define “safe” and “convenient.”</li> </ol>	<p>Opened 1/18</p> <p>Closed 2/15</p>

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>Staff believes this approach allows the policy language to remain at a high-level, which is usually appropriate, and for the Transportation Master Plan to be the document that contains additional project detail.</p> <p>2/15: Staff proposes the following language for policy N-SE-46: <i>Plan for a <u>safe and convenient</u> crossing of Redmond Way near the light rail station area to provide better nonmotorized access to the station from the northeast.</i></p> <p>2/8: Staff estimated the number of jobs and households within ¼- and ½-mile of the light rail station with and without a grade-separated crossing of Redmond Way. The analysis concluded that 335 people would be added to the walkshed – all of which are associated with the Home Depot and Fred Meyer parcels. If those parcels redeveloped at higher densities, then the number would increase. For context, the Overlake Village pedestrian and bicycle bridge over SR 520 adds about 7,000 people to the walkshed of the Overlake Village light rail station.</p> <p>Absent a grade-separated crossing, pedestrians and bicyclists on the north side of Redmond Way will be able to access the Marymoor Subarea at NE 70<sup>th</sup> St. This at-grade route adds about 700 feet of travel (0.13 miles) as compared to the grade-separated route.</p> <p>1/25: Policy N-SE-46 calls for a grade-separated crossing of Redmond Way to connect the light rail station area to the Regional Retail Subarea to the northeast. In conjunction with the infrastructure planning effort, staff conducted a planning-level feasibility analysis to evaluate costs and benefits. The planning-level cost was estimated to be \$8-\$20 million excluding land. An analysis of the potential benefits concluded that with this improvement no additional walkshed would be added within 5 minutes of the light rail station, and that the Home Depot and Fred Meyer sites would be added to the 10 minute walkshed from the station. Staff concluded that the number of potential users could not justify the required investment and so is recommending removing this policy from the Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan. Staff provided the draft policy language to the South Marymoor Subarea Committee in 2016, though this was not the focus of the Committee’s discussion.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>D3. How will the proposed natural drainage system be developed? (Miller, Jan. 13, 2017 item #39)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>                      Commissioner Miller requested additional information regarding the stormwater system proposed for the Marymoor Subarea. He asked how the system would be developed such as in phases or portions and whether efficiencies could be accrued for developing as a complete system improvement.</p> <p>1/25: Commissioner Miller asked that this item reference item D1 and be closed.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u>                      The recommended stormwater strategy for the Marymoor Subarea is on-site infiltration. This is a continuation of the primary strategy used today, and is attractive due to favorable soil conditions and the benefits that recharging the aquifer provides. One benefit of on-site infiltration is that it can be implemented on a site-by-site basis. The same is true in the public realm: on-site stormwater infiltration from streets can be infiltrated on a segment-by-segment basis as streets are retrofitted or constructed.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	<p>Opened 1/18</p> <p>Closed 1/25</p>
<p>D4. What are the potential impacts of the proposed roundabout at NE 70<sup>th</sup> Street and 176<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. (Miller, Nichols, MacNichols)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>                      2/8: Commissioner Miller noted that he wanted to emphasize the safety and design issues of regional trail crossings near roundabouts. Commissioners were satisfied with staff’s response and closed this issue.</p> <p>2/3: Commissioner Miller to what level the Planning Commission would have opportunity to discuss the elements and recommendations of the infrastructure report. In this regard, he requested additional information on the proposed roundabout at NE 70<sup>th</sup> Street and 176<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE including its relationship to the adjacent private properties and to the East Lake Sammamish Trail.</p> <p>1/23: Commissioner Nichols also requested additional information regarding the decision process including the analysis and alternatives that were considered.</p>	<p>Opened 1/18</p> <p>Closed 2/8</p>

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>1/25: Commissioners Miller, Nichols, and MacNichols requested additional information regarding the benefits of a roundabout at this location and how the regional trail would be integrated into the design, including how the trail would safely cross 176<sup>th</sup> Ave NE near the roundabout.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p>2/8: FHWA provides information about the general benefits of roundabouts at <a href="http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/intersection/innovative/roundabouts/">http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/intersection/innovative/roundabouts/</a>. Safety as compared to conventional intersections are a major benefit. Other considerations include reduced congestion, reduced pollution and fuel use, and cost savings. Together with the general benefits of roundabouts, the roundabout in the draft Marymoor Subarea infrastructure plan is included to reduce potential queue lengths on 176<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and NE 70<sup>th</sup> St compared to a conventional intersection.</p> <p>1/25: The roundabout at NE 70<sup>th</sup> St. and 176<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, along with the extension of 176<sup>th</sup> Ave NE north to Redmond Way, will require new right-of-way. The amount of land acquisition and the specific property impacts cannot be specifically determined based on the conceptual design completed as part of the infrastructure planning effort. The extension could impact parking and possibly structures, though future design work would attempt to reduce impact and cost.</p> <p>The East Lake Sammamish Trail must cross NE 70<sup>th</sup> St. in order to pass through the SR 520 interchange area. The draft infrastructure plan shows a conceptual crossing of NE 70<sup>th</sup> St, but does not recommend a specific design. Staff is aware that trail crossings at or near roundabouts require special attention to the safety and comfort of trail users. Future design of the crossing would take that into account.</p> <p>The primary purpose of the 176<sup>th</sup> Ave NE extension to Redmond Way is to provide additional ingress and egress to/from the Marymoor Subarea. The need for additional access to the subarea was recognized as early as 2011 in the East Link Record of Decision (ROD) to accommodate anticipated vehicle trips to/from the light rail station and park-and-ride. (The ROD identifies an additional right-turn pocket from EB Redmond Way to WB NE 70<sup>th</sup> St. as the required access and also allows Sound Transit and the City to coordinate “similar”</p>	

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>improvements, such as the extension of 176<sup>th</sup> Ave NE.) The City’s subarea planning work reinforces the need to provide adequate access.</p> <p>Staff considered two other access alternatives, chiefly considering: the vision for the subarea; pedestrian and bicyclist safety and comfort; access for all modes; access to the station; and ped-bike access to Marymoor Park, Downtown, and the rest of Southeast Redmond. All of the alternatives would have property impacts.</p> <p>One alternative is building the additional right-turn lane on EB Redmond Way to WB NE 70<sup>th</sup> St. identified in the ROD. This alternative would provide additional ingress but no egress. It would also widen an already wide crossing of NE 70<sup>th</sup> St., decreasing pedestrian comfort.</p> <p>Staff also considered direct access from SR 520 into the subarea, an idea generated during outreach. This option would provide direct access for those on EB SR 520 seeking to access the subarea or the E Lk Samm Pkwy corridor. Its usefulness would depend in part on queues on EB SR 520. It would impact the ability to achieve land use and walkability goals near the station and likely increase the difficulty of constructing ped-bike access from the E Lk Samm Trail to the light rail station. It would be unusual for WSDOT to approve an additional access unless it was tied into the existing interchange.</p> <p>In testimony, Mark Zenger stated that the usefulness of extending 176<sup>th</sup> Ave NE would depend on queues on Redmond Way. If EB Redmond Way is congested then drivers would not be able to access the extension during peak congestion. This points to the larger issue of congestion on arterials surrounding the Marymoor Subarea. To that end the City Council approved funding for additional study of engineering and operational solutions for congestion and access issues at intersections adjacent to the Marymoor Subarea, including the Redmond Way/E Lk Samm Pkwy intersection.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
<p>D5. Can the recommended street network be amended according to Mr. Carlson’s testimony while</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 2/8: Commissioners were satisfied with staff’s response and closed the issue.</p>	<p>Opened 1/25</p>

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>achieving the subarea plan’s intent? (Miller)</p>	<p>2/3: Commissioner Miller requested that this item be included on the issues matrix for the Commission’s discussion.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> Type III streets can be either shared space or exclusively non-motorized, depending on site characteristics. No change is required to the infrastructure plan to allow for a non-motorized-only design for NE 69<sup>th</sup> St.</p> <p>The intent of the north/south extension of the future 177<sup>th</sup> Ave NE north of the future NE 68<sup>th</sup> St to the future NE 69<sup>th</sup> St is to provide convenient access – potentially only non-motorized access – to the east half of the subject site. Mr. Carlson proposes an alternative whereby access to the east side of the site would be provided via a connection from the East Lake Sammamish Trail at the 6800 and 6900 blocks. Staff supports the trail connections. However, this would create an east-west block length of about 775 feet, exceeding the target of 400 feet specified in N-SE-45. One alternative would be to create a shared street or non-motorized path from the 6800 to the 6900 block about midway between 176<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and the east property boundary.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> Brian Carlson requested modifying the draft street network and street types required for his and fellow owners’ property. The alternative would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Changing the functionality of NE 69<sup>th</sup> Street (recommended Type III) to a “green street” intended solely for pedestrian and bicyclist use; and</li> <li>- Realigning NE 69<sup>th</sup> Street (recommended Type III) to run east/west from 176<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE to the East Lake Sammamish Trail, converting at its end to a trail connection and not bending to the south to connect to the future 177<sup>th</sup> Ave NE.</li> </ul>	<p>Closed 2/8</p>
<p><b>E. Complete Streets</b></p>		
<p>E1. What is the relationship of the proposed amendments to functional plans and the Zoning Code regarding infrastructure requirements for this subarea to the City’s adopted</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> Commissioner Miller asked how the proposed Subarea street grid and enhancements related to walkability and connectivity relate to the City’s adopted Complete Streets Policy.</p>	<p>Opened 1/18</p> <p>Closed 1/25</p>

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>Complete Streets policy? (Miller, Jan. 13, 2017 item #9, Nichols)</p>	<p>1/25: Commissioner Miller and Nichols noted that the recommended mixed-uses and retention of existing manufacturing uses throughout the Subarea should be considered in the design of the street types and cross-sections. They agreed to close this item and requested referencing this item to item D1.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p>2/8: As noted in issue D1, the priority projects identified in the infrastructure plan would complete the Type 1 street system, providing primary vehicle and bicycle circulation in the subarea. One concern expressed was that vehicle traffic – including trucks – associated with manufacturing uses would continue to use streets in the subarea for an indefinite period of time. That is the case for Type 1 streets. Type 2 and Type 3 streets would most likely be constructed as part of property redevelopment to mixed-use/multifamily uses. Thus, truck traffic on Type 2 and Type 3 streets is likely to be much lower than on Type 1 streets, reducing potential conflicts.</p> <p>1/25: Staff believes that the proposed amendments are consistent with the City’s Complete Streets ordinance (Ord. 2844) last revised in October 2016. Among the key elements of Redmond’s approach are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasizing comprehensive and connected networks</li> <li>• Recognizing that complete streets are for all modes including cars, freight, and transit vehicles</li> <li>• Recognizing that one size does not fit all – context matters when designing solutions</li> <li>• Working with neighboring cities and other partners rather than focusing only on City projects</li> </ul> <p>In the Marymoor Subarea, Type 1 streets would carry the highest volumes and so in that instance dedicated bicycle facilities are preferred over shared facilities. Type 2 and 3 streets are planned as low-volume, low-speed streets where shared facilities are appropriate. The proposed multi-purpose trails would exclusively serve non-motorized travelers, providing local and regional connections.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>E2. Can the Marymoor Subarea Street Requirements be clarified and modified to better represent current FHWA and other national standards? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>                      2/8: Commissioners were satisfied with staff’s response and closed this issue.</p> <p>1/25: Commissioner Miller requested the following modifications and updates to the Marymoor Subarea Street Requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Type III street pedestrian zones should be a minimum of 5’;</li> <li>- Bike boxes should be colored green;</li> <li>- Type II streets should have dedicated bicycle facilities in light of 10-foot travel lanes, parking, and truck traffic;</li> <li>- Woonerfs are not an appropriate treatment as presented given the Subarea’s likely mix of manufacturing and multifamily uses for a long period of time; and</li> <li>- The scale of the graphics for Figure 19. Type III Street Hypothetical Street Sections should be consistent for all elements of the Figure.</li> </ul> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u>                      Staff will make the technical corrections requested by Commissioners. Also see response to E1 for policy discussion of the transportation network.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	<p>Opened 1/25</p> <p>Closed 2/8</p>
<p>F. Sound Transit’s Park &amp; Ride Structure</p>		
<p>F1. Does the City have a preferred location for Sound Transit’s park &amp; ride structure identified in the Subarea plan? (Miller, Jan. 13, 2017 items #11, 31, 34, 35, 36, Nichols, MacNichols, Captain)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>                      2/15: Commissioner Miller concurred with the updated language staff provided on 2/15. He also asked that staff confirm the plan no longer references a specific location for Sound Transit’s park &amp; ride structure. Commissioners agreed to close this item.</p> <p>2/8: Commissioners discussed the proposed values to guide light rail station area design and identified two additional values. The first was pedestrian access and mobility, with Commissioners desiring to recognize the impact of the park-and-ride structure on pedestrian mobility, and to highlight the ability of pedestrians to safely move to and around the station area. The second was the relationship between this station and other stations on the line, recognizing that each station has a unique function, and desiring that those functions</p>	<p>Opened 1/18</p> <p>Closed 2/15</p>

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>complement each other. Commissioners also noted that “integration with the neighborhood” should include the station’s relationship to the variety of uses within the subarea and Marymoor Park.</p> <p>2/3: Commissioner Miller asked what the City’s preferred location is for Sound Transit’s 1,400 stall park &amp; ride structure within the Marymoor Subarea and if that information including the criteria and other locations considered in determining the preferred location will be presented to the Planning Commission for review. He requested examples of other facilities in the Puget Sound region where the park &amp; ride structure is located at a distance from the light rail station.</p> <p>Commissioner Miller also asked whether the Marymoor Velodrome Association had been contacted regarding the garage siting.</p> <p>1/25: Commissioners continued their discussion of this item and recommended the following values for consideration of a preferred location:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proximity to the light rail station platform;</li> <li>- Consistency with pedestrian-oriented neighborhood including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Easily walkable from structure to the station;</li> <li>o Avoids interfering with neighborhood walkability;</li> <li>o Ensures pedestrian safety by separating vehicles from pedestrian routes and plazas; and</li> <li>o 173<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NE serve a significant role in neighborhood and transit user pedestrian mobility;</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Supports reduced traffic impacts on SR-202 and from surround areas; and</li> <li>- Compatibility with Marymoor Park.</li> </ul> <p>Commissioners also requested that staff remove from consideration the value of convenient access from the parking garage to Marymoor Park also in the event of possible shared use agreements or other similar opportunities.</p> <p>The park &amp; ride structure should also support the creation of station plaza that is a safe venue for pedestrian activity, separated from vehicular traffic. The structure could also be</p>	

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>sited to create a physical separation or wall between the neighborhood and SR-520 such as for noise mitigation.</p> <p>Commissioners requested additional information regarding the process for communicating these values to Sound Transit.</p> <p>Commissioner Miller asked whether staff has had contact in this regard with the Marymoor Velodrome Association. He also requested consolidating items F2, F3, and G1 into this item for additional discussion.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p>2/15: Staff understands the values to guide station area design, as refined by the Planning Commission, to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Safety</b> means minimizing the potential conflicts between pedestrians, bicycle, and vehicles in the vicinity of the station (conflict with trains was not considered in this planning effort, but would be in a station design effort).</li> <li>• <b>Access to transit</b> means convenient access to the bus and rail transit at the station for people arriving by all modes.</li> <li>• <b>Pedestrian access and mobility</b> means the ability of pedestrians to safely and conveniently travel to and through the light rail station area, including the parking structure.</li> <li>• <b>Integration with the neighborhood</b> means supporting the vision for the subarea especially in terms of urban design, scale, and relationship to the variety of other uses in the subarea and in Marymoor Park.</li> <li>• <b>Relationship to other Redmond stations</b> means that the functions of the Southeast Redmond station should complement the functions of the Downtown and Overlake light rail stations.</li> </ul> <p>Staff will summarize the Planning Commission’s discussion on this topic at the Council’s February 21, 2017 meeting.</p> <p>2/8: Commissioners desired to discuss the park-and-ride structure in terms of values and how those values have been applied in developing the Marymoor Subarea plan. Staff</p>	

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status						
	<p>believes it would be beneficial to consider the station as a whole in terms of values in order to put the park-and-ride in context.</p> <p>Three values underlie the proposed site for the parking structure and station plaza vis-à-vis the station platforms: safety, access to transit, and integration with the neighborhood. In this context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Safety</b> means minimizing the potential conflicts between pedestrians, bicycle, and vehicles in the vicinity of the station (conflict with trains was not considered in this planning effort, but would be in a station design effort).</li> <li>• <b>Access to transit</b> means convenient access to the bus and rail transit at the station for people arriving by all modes.</li> <li>• <b>Integration with the neighborhood</b> means supporting the vision for the subarea especially in terms of urban design and scale</li> </ul> <p>The table below describes how these values are applied in the draft plan.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="682 769 1793 1386"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="682 769 892 807">Value</th> <th data-bbox="898 769 1793 807">Application of Value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="682 807 892 1133">Safety</td> <td data-bbox="898 807 1793 1133"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Patrons arriving by car do not cross 173<sup>rd</sup> or 70<sup>th</sup> to access station platforms</li> <li>• Other pedestrians arrive via network of sidewalks and crosswalks, or via non-motorized paths when built</li> <li>• Station accessed via dedicated bicycle facilities (extent of network depends on completion of Type 1 Street re-channelization)</li> <li>• Goal is for bus-rail transfers to occur near station and minimize street crossings – bus-rail transfer zone not designed as part of subarea planning process</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="682 1133 892 1386">Access to Transit</td> <td data-bbox="898 1133 1793 1386"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access for pedestrians and bicyclists is immediately adjacent to station</li> <li>• Access for bus transit patrons is adjacent to station in concept – bus-rail transfer zone not designed as part of subarea planning process</li> <li>• Access for pedestrians via park-and-ride is, from the middle of the ground floor of the proposed location, about 700 feet. At a pace of 20 minutes per mile, that equates to about 2.5 minutes.</li> </ul> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Value	Application of Value	Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Patrons arriving by car do not cross 173<sup>rd</sup> or 70<sup>th</sup> to access station platforms</li> <li>• Other pedestrians arrive via network of sidewalks and crosswalks, or via non-motorized paths when built</li> <li>• Station accessed via dedicated bicycle facilities (extent of network depends on completion of Type 1 Street re-channelization)</li> <li>• Goal is for bus-rail transfers to occur near station and minimize street crossings – bus-rail transfer zone not designed as part of subarea planning process</li> </ul>	Access to Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access for pedestrians and bicyclists is immediately adjacent to station</li> <li>• Access for bus transit patrons is adjacent to station in concept – bus-rail transfer zone not designed as part of subarea planning process</li> <li>• Access for pedestrians via park-and-ride is, from the middle of the ground floor of the proposed location, about 700 feet. At a pace of 20 minutes per mile, that equates to about 2.5 minutes.</li> </ul>	
Value	Application of Value							
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Patrons arriving by car do not cross 173<sup>rd</sup> or 70<sup>th</sup> to access station platforms</li> <li>• Other pedestrians arrive via network of sidewalks and crosswalks, or via non-motorized paths when built</li> <li>• Station accessed via dedicated bicycle facilities (extent of network depends on completion of Type 1 Street re-channelization)</li> <li>• Goal is for bus-rail transfers to occur near station and minimize street crossings – bus-rail transfer zone not designed as part of subarea planning process</li> </ul>							
Access to Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access for pedestrians and bicyclists is immediately adjacent to station</li> <li>• Access for bus transit patrons is adjacent to station in concept – bus-rail transfer zone not designed as part of subarea planning process</li> <li>• Access for pedestrians via park-and-ride is, from the middle of the ground floor of the proposed location, about 700 feet. At a pace of 20 minutes per mile, that equates to about 2.5 minutes.</li> </ul>							

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status		
	<table border="1" data-bbox="684 228 1791 451"> <tr> <td data-bbox="684 228 894 451">Integration with the Neighborhood</td> <td data-bbox="894 228 1791 451"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Park-and-ride structure is located on edge of subarea to allow mixed-use/multifamily development in core of subarea</li> <li>• Opportunities for transit-oriented development exist adjacent to station</li> <li>• Park-and-ride location strengthens future pedestrian-supportive uses along 173<sup>rd</sup> Ave NE</li> </ul> </td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="684 492 1791 841">1/25: In the past, the City Council has expressed preferences via letters or resolutions to Sound Transit with regard to alignment and station locations. City Council has expressed to Sound Transit via letter that the parking structure must integrate seamlessly into the surrounding transit-oriented neighborhood, and that shared parking and street-level retail should be explored to ensure that the garage supports access to East Link and the vibrancy of the neighborhood. The Council has not expressed a preferred location for the park and ride structure. The depicted location in the infrastructure plan is intended to meet the City’s interests as expressed in the above-referenced letter, and also represents the following considerations that staff discussed with the Infrastructure Study workgroup and provided for information to the South Marymoor Subarea Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walkable to the light rail station.</li> <li>• Convenient transit access.</li> <li>• Adequate queueing distance from Redmond Way.</li> <li>• Relationship to the Subarea including:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Avoiding the creation of a wall separating portions of the Subarea;</li> <li>○ Providing for convenient parking opportunities in the event of shared use agreements or other similar opportunities; and</li> <li>○ Opportunity for integrating with desired neighborhood land uses such as pedestrian-supportive uses at the street level.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Convenient access to Marymoor Park also in the event of possible shared use agreements or other similar opportunities.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="684 1284 1791 1417">Since Sound Transit’s design for the Southeast Redmond station will progress quickly in 2017, staff believes that the best approach for providing additional input on the parking structure location is to identify considerations that the City can use when working with Sound Transit. At Planning Commission’s January 25 study session, staff will seek input from Planning</p>	Integration with the Neighborhood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Park-and-ride structure is located on edge of subarea to allow mixed-use/multifamily development in core of subarea</li> <li>• Opportunities for transit-oriented development exist adjacent to station</li> <li>• Park-and-ride location strengthens future pedestrian-supportive uses along 173<sup>rd</sup> Ave NE</li> </ul>	
Integration with the Neighborhood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Park-and-ride structure is located on edge of subarea to allow mixed-use/multifamily development in core of subarea</li> <li>• Opportunities for transit-oriented development exist adjacent to station</li> <li>• Park-and-ride location strengthens future pedestrian-supportive uses along 173<sup>rd</sup> Ave NE</li> </ul>			

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

*Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>Commissioners as to whether any considerations in addition to those above should be included.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
<p>F2. How does the depicted location of the park &amp; ride structure integrate with the planned light rail station? (Miller, Jan. 13, 2017 item #23)</p> <p>This item has been consolidated with item F1.</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>                      Commissioner Miller asked how the Subarea plan’s depicted location of Sound Transit’s park &amp; ride structure meets the intent proposed for the MDD1 zone, the purpose of which is to provide transit-oriented housing and employment adjacent to and integrated with the planned light rail station.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u>                      Staff estimates the depicted location of the park &amp; ride structure being within approximately 500 feet of the anticipated light rail station platform. However, station area design has not been completed. The siting shown allows for opportunity of locating other transit-oriented uses including housing and employment nearer to the station platform, if desired. As well, the location provides for other design options such as plazas, pick-up and drop-off locations, short term and ADA parking, and more. Additional information will become available as conceptual station area design is completed in the next several months.</p> <p>Please also see the staff response to issue F1 above.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	<p>Opened 1/18</p> <p>Referred to item F1 (Closed 2/15)</p>
<p>F3. How will MDD1 design standards be incorporated into the park &amp; ride structure? (Miller, Jan. 13, 2017 item #19, 29, 32, 33)</p> <p>This item has been consolidated with item F1.</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>                      Commissioner Miller asked for additional information regarding the proposed design standards for MDD1 in relationship to Sound Transit’s park &amp; ride structure. He referenced Map 13.# Pedestrian-Oriented Block Faces in exhibit F of the Committee’s report in his request for clarification regarding encouragement for pedestrian-supportive uses at the park &amp; ride frontage, including along 173rd. Also, in reference to the Committee’s exhibit F, page 31 of 35, Commissioner Miller asked how the design standard requiring buildings to take advantage of the park as a visual amenity would be implemented at the park &amp; ride structure.</p>	<p>Opened 1/18</p> <p>Referred to item F1 (Closed 2/15)</p>

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u>                      If the parking structure is located adjacent to Marymoor Park it is staff’s expectation that the designers of the parking structure would, to the extent possible for a parking structure, take advantage of the adjacency and create views into the park from the parking structure. It would be up to the designers to propose how that would be accomplished, and the proposal would be reviewed by staff and the Design Review Board for compliance with these and other design standards.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
<p>F4. Have agreements been discussed or established regarding fee-based parking such as for special events at Marymoor Park? (Miller, Jan. 13, 2017 items #29, 34)</p> <p>This item has been consolidated with item F1.</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>                      Commissioner Miller asked whether an agreement has been established between King County Park and Sound Transit regarding opportunities for fee-based parking at the park &amp; ride garage in support of special park events.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u>                      This question was responded to during testimony at the Jan. 18, 2017 public hearing by King County staff. No agreements has been discussed or established.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	<p>Opened 1/18</p> <p>Referred to item F1 (Closed 2/15)</p>
<p><b>G. Pedestrian-Oriented Land Uses</b></p>		
<p>G1. What is the rationale for not having pedestrian-supportive land uses on the west side of 173<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NE? (Miller, Jan. 13, 2017 item #19)</p> <p>This item has been consolidated with item F1.</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>                      Commissioner Miller cited 21.13.140 MDD Building Placement and Form, map 13.# Pedestrian-Oriented Block Faces, Exhibit C3, page 30 of 43 in his request for additional information describing the rationale for not requiring pedestrian-supportive uses along 173<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NE between NE 68<sup>th</sup> and 70<sup>th</sup> Streets (MDD1 Block 2). He asked staff to describe this street segment’s relationship to the depicted siting of Sound Transit’s park &amp; ride garage and anticipated pedestrian and transit-rider volumes.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u>                      There is significant uncertainty as to the design of MDD1 Block 2. It is not known, for example, how much of the parcel will be required for permanent light rail station</p>	<p>Opened 1/18</p> <p>Referred to item F1 (Closed 2/15)</p>

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>infrastructure and amenities. The proposed pedestrian-oriented use requirements for that block are based on a concept that would result in a station plaza on the east half of the block and pedestrian-oriented uses on the west part of the block. There are other potential concepts, including placing pedestrian-oriented uses directly against the west edge of 173<sup>rd</sup> Ave NE, that would also serve City goals in the light rail station area.</p> <p>Although station design is in its beginning stages, it is expected to progress quickly in the first half of 2017. One alternative would be to re-draft portions of the pedestrian-oriented block face requirements to take account of the uncertainty while still requiring pedestrian-oriented block faces in the station-to-park-and-ride corridor.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
<p>G2. Can the required ground-floor retail, pedestrian-oriented uses be provided along other streets to meet the same intent for the Marymoor Subarea? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>2/15: Commissioners agreed to close this item and supported the plan refinements consistent with the property owner’s requests.</p> <p>2/8: Commissioners briefly discussed this request and noted their interest in providing opportunity for uses to transition over time. They agreed that staff should continue working with the property owner to clarify their request and to develop a response.</p> <p>Commissioner Miller requested that this item be included on the issues matrix for the Commission’s discussion.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p>2/15: Staff presented refinements to the subarea plan that would support the property owner’s request including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An additional classification of ground-floor frontage type that encourages pedestrian-oriented uses and also allows residential uses. This would be applied along NE 68<sup>th</sup> St;</li> <li>• A change from pedestrian-supportive uses required to being encouraged at the corner of NE 68<sup>th</sup> St and the East Lake Sammamish Trail;</li> <li>• Allowing 173<sup>rd</sup> Ave NE to meet NE 68<sup>th</sup> St though not to proceed north into the Carlson site; and</li> <li>• Confirming that NE 69<sup>th</sup> Street could be designed as a non-motorized street as currently recommended via the Type III street standard.</li> </ul>	<p>Opened 1/25</p> <p>Closed 2/15</p>

**Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)**

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for March 15, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>2/8: Staff would like to continue evaluating this request and to provide a follow up response at the Commission’s February 15 meeting.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p>Brian Carlson provided testimony requesting opportunity for his site to provide through redevelopment alternative frontage locations for meeting the requirement for ground-floor retail, pedestrian-oriented uses. He described his and the fellow property owners’ understanding of a low likelihood for redevelopment at the property located to their south where the recommended code calls for pedestrian supportive uses. He also noted anticipated increased visibility and opportunity for leasing future retail spaces if provided along NE 70<sup>th</sup> Street or 176<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.</p>	